

REMARKS

In this Reply, Applicant has amended claims 1, 9, 17, and 24. Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, 11, 13, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29, and 33-45 are currently pending.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 11, 16, 17, 19, 23, 24, 27, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,313,848 to Hoag ("Hoag") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20050005236 of Brown et al. ("Brown"), and rejected claims 5, 13, 21, 29, and 34-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoag in view of Brown and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,865,720 of Otani ("Otani"). Applicant traverses.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner must factually demonstrate that (1) the references disclose or suggest each and every element recited in the claims; (2) there is a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention by modification of the teachings of the references, and (3) there exists some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or combine the teachings of the references to produce the claimed invention. See M.P.E.P. §§ 2142, 2143 (8th ed., May 2004 rev.). Furthermore, each of these requirements must be found in the prior art - not in Applicant's disclosure. See *Id.* The Office Action fails to demonstrate all of these requirements.

The Office Action does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness at least because Hoag does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claims, and neither Brown nor Otani cures this deficiency. For example, independent claim 1 as amended recites "selecting from the data for the list item a data element that will be

displayed in both the first window and the second window.” The other independent claims recite features of similar scope.

Hoag teaches a method for displaying, in a single window on a computer display screen, tabular data arranged in rows and columns, where the single window is divided into panes, and each pane contains a unique set of columns from the tabular data. (Abstract, col. 2, lines 1-11; Figs. 5 and 6.) As shown in Figures 5 and 6, Hoag displays different columns of data in each of panes 511 and 512. Specifically, the upper pane 511 in Figures 5 and 6 of Hoag displays the columns of data “1. More Info,” “2. Object ID,” “3. Class Name,” “4. Source Object ID,” “5. Severity,” and “6. Type.” The lower pane 512 in Figures 5 and 6 displays different columns and does not display any of the same table data that is displayed in the upper pane.

As also shown in Figures 5 and 6, Hoag discloses displaying header columns 522 and 523 in panes 511 and 512 respectively, but the header columns 522 and 523 employ arbitrary row labels 1 through 10, not a data element selected from the data for the list item, as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner has argued that the row labels perform the function of identifying correspondence between a top pane and a bottom pane and thus teach “displaying at least one element of data from the first portion of the list item in the second window to identify correspondence between the second portion and the first portion.” (OA p.2.) This is incorrect because the row labels are not a data element selected from the data for the list item. The row labels are arbitrary labels that have no relationship whatsoever to the data that is being displayed. According to Hoag's teachings, when entirely different data tables are displayed, the row labels remain the same. Accordingly, Hoag

fails to teach or suggest "selecting from the data for the list item a data element that will be displayed in both the first window and the second window," among other things.

Brown and Otani fail to cure the deficiencies of Hoag.

For at least the reasons stated above, neither Hoag nor Brown nor Otani, whether taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose all the elements recited in independent claim 1. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established and claim 1 is allowable. In addition, independent claims 9, 17, and 24 recite similar features to those of claim 1, and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons. Furthermore, because claims 3, 5, 8, 11, 13, 16, 19, 21, 23, 27, 29, and 33-45 depend from claims 1, 9, 17, and 24, they are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable base claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections of all these claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: December 7, 2006

By: William J. Brogan
William J. Brogan
Reg. No. 43,515